

REMARKS

The Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of February 10, 2004. The quality and clarity of the Office Action, the participation of the Examiner in a telephone interview and the Examiner's cooperation in reviewing proposed claim amendments is noted with appreciation. Amendment, reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

The Office Action

In the Office Action of February 10, 2004:

Claims 1, 4-6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,164,842 to Gauronski et al. ("Gauronski") in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,936,180 to Willard et al. ("Willard") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,488,223 to Austin et al. ("Austin");

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauronski, Willard and Austin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,011,940 to Van Lydegraf ("Van Lydegraf");

Claims 11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,559,606 to Webster et al. ("Webster") in view of Van Lydegraf, Willard and Austin;

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Webster, Van Lydegraf, Willard and Austin in further view of Gauronski.

In The Drawings

The Applicants submitted formal drawings on August 7, 2002. Additionally, corrected formal drawings were submitted along with the Applicants Amendment A on November 17, 2003. The Applicants have reviewed their records and can find to no acknowledgement that the Examiner received or has accepted the formal drawings. Acknowledgement of the acceptability of the filed drawings is respectfully requested.

Telephone Interview Summary

Participation of the Examiner, Mr. Justin Foster in telephone interviews with

the representative of the Applicants, Mr. Thomas Tillander on March 3, 2004 is noted with appreciation. In those conversations, Mr. Tillander addressed the "Response to Arguments" presented in the Office Action mailed February 10, 2004. Additionally, **Claim 1** was discussed. Some general agreements were reached and the Examiner suggested that proposed claim amendments be provided for review.

On March 4, 2004, Mr. Tillander transmitted two sets of proposed claim amendments to the Examiner.

On March 5, 2004, the Examiner indicated that both sets of claims appeared to be allowable in light of the cited references and would be entered if presented in a formal amendment. The first set of proposed claim amendments are formally presented herein.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted all claims remaining in the application (**Claims 1, 4-6 and 9-14**) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing amendments are supported throughout the specification (for example, see page 7, line 19 - page 8, line 14) and do not represent new matter and should not require an additional search or create an undue burden on the Examiner.

In the interests of advancing this application to issue the Applicant(s) respectfully request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned to discuss the foregoing or any suggestions that the Examiner may have to place the case in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP

Date

4/8/04

Patrick R. Roche
Patrick R. Roche
Reg. No. 29,580
Thomas Tillander
Reg. No. 47,334
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582